



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/810,646 03/03/97 JACOBSEN

J KPN96-03A2

EXAMINER

LM02/0525

THOMAS O HOOVER  
HAMILTON SMITH BROOK & REYNOLDS  
TWO MILITIA DRIVE  
LEXINGTON MA 02173

PIZIALI, J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2778

DATE MAILED:

05/25/99

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
08/810,646

Applicant(s)  
Jacobsen et al.

Examiner  
Jeff Piziali

Group Art Unit  
2778



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Mar 3, 1997

☐ This action is FINAL.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☒ The drawing(s) filed on Mar 3, 1997 is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been  
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 4,5,6

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2778

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Drawings*

1. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required if the application is allowed.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3. Claims 1-3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gotoh et al. (5,677,727).

In regards to claim 1, Gotoh et al. disclose a telephone docking system (refer to Figure 1; Column 1, Lines 9-15) comprising: a housing having an interconnect port electrically connecting a housing circuit [24c] to an attached telephone [26] (refer to Figure 2; Column 8, Lines 32-33; Column 9, Lines 39-43), and a matrix display [21b] mounted to the housing receiving display data from the circuit (refer to Figure 1; Column 1, Lines 10-11; Column 4, Lines 2-6).

Art Unit: 2778

In regards to claim 2, Gotoh et al. disclose a housing comprising first [134] and second [76] display ports (refer to Figures 8, 14A; Column 12, Lines 48-50; Column 15, Lines 4-5).

In regards to claim 3, Gotoh et al. disclose mounting a matrix display to a housing at a first [110] or second display [113] port (refer to Figure 12; Column 1, Lines 10-11; Column 4, Lines 2-6).

In regards to claim 5, Gotoh et al. disclose a color sequential circuit [Picture Codec Unit] (refer to Figures 2, 7; Column 12, Lines 3-5).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gotoh et al. (5,677,727) in view of Swanson et al. (5,889,567).

In regards to claim 4, Gotoh et al. do not expressly disclose a matrix display comprising a transistor circuit array formed with single crystal silicon, and bonding the array to an optically transmissive substrate with an adhesive layer. However, Swanson et al. do disclose a matrix

Art Unit: 2778

display comprising a transistor circuit array formed with single crystal silicon (refer to Column 18, Lines 55-57), and bonding the array to an optically transmissive substrate with an adhesive layer (refer to Column 3, Lines 7-10). Gotoh et al. and Swanson et al. are analogous art because they are from the field of color liquid crystal display devices. At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Swanson's matrix display with Gotoh's telephone docking system. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide an image display of high pixel density. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gotoh et al. with Swanson et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 4.

In regards to claim 6, Gotoh et al. do not expressly disclose an active matrix liquid crystal display and an LED backlight. However, Swanson et al. do disclose an active matrix liquid crystal display (refer to Column 3, Lines 6-7) and an LED backlight [215] (refer to Figure 17; Column 16, Lines 51-58). Gotoh et al. and Swanson et al. are analogous art because they are from the field of color liquid crystal display devices. At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Swanson's active matrix liquid crystal display with Gotoh's telephone docking system. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide an image display visible even under dark conditions. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gotoh et al. with Swanson et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 6.

Art Unit: 2778

*Conclusion*

6. The art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Guichard et al. (5,111,498), Guicard et al. (5,170,427), Yoshikazu (5,568,185), and Yuyama et al. (5,825,408) are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to telephone docking systems and matrix displays.

Art Unit: 2778

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeff Piziali whose telephone number is (703) 305-8382. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 6:30 AM to 3 PM E.S.T.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala, can be reached on (703) 305-4938.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

**Or:**

(703) 308-6606 (for informal or draft communications, please label

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).



**MATTHEW LUU  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

*JP-5/21/99*